

ADDENDA.

THE GIBBETING OF DR. E. S. GAILLARD.

There are various grades of conduct of criminals in their approach to execution. Some are defiant, incorrigible, and impenitent. Others are evasive, deceptive, and full of falsehood, even in the presence of the paraphernalia of their doom. Dr. Gaillard belongs to the latter category. He has, in the supplement to the October number of his lying Medical Police Gazette, placed himself bound hand and foot in my hands, as he shall find before I get through with this notice of him. Scourged as he has been in each and every attempt he has made as a literary and scientific critic, he has now descended into that filth so congenial to him, that which consists not merely of personalities, but of lying personalities.

In no one of his bungling efforts at writing has Dr. G. given better specimens of "blighted rhetoric" and "arrest of development," than in his October supplement. Here is a specimen of the latter kind. Dr. Gaillard says: "After unmasking him fully," &c., "*he was charged!*" A grammarian can not construe that so as to make any sense of it. Again: "*Those who have studied Macleod knows that what the writer said of him is strictly true.*" Oh yes, *those knows*. Again: "Sophistry and dishonesty is easily met." What are "*surgeries?*" What is "the enactment of the moral enormity?" What is "prestigation," and why is it "too base to be *sufficiently characterized?*" What meaning is there in saying "ventilation and pure air *tended* to prevent," &c? "He stands," &c.,

"a complete failure, and this failure is largely due," &c. Why make failure do duty as a *person* and as a *result* in one sentence? Again: "There *occurs* a few typographical errors?" Again "What *honesty and fairness* there is," &c?

The peregrinating Medical Professor, who leaves medical schools for their good, says that I am "a failure personally, socially, and professionally." This may be, when measured by the Gaillard standard, but as that is a poor thing, it does not amount to much. I have but a few words to say to the Yahoo on this subject. My social position is all that I can desire it to be. If I could make any change in it by merely turning my hand, I would not turn it. If I am not the welcome associate of many of the best people of Kentucky, there are no good people in Kentucky. If I am not the daily companion of men and women infinitely above the position of Dr. Gaillard, then there are neither good nor reputable people in Louisville. During a period of nine years I held the great chair of the Science and Practice of Medicine in one of the most renowned medical schools in the United States. I retired from that position voluntarily, and against the wishes of my eminent colleagues. After two years of retirement, I had such a flattering call to resume the place, that, against my personal wishes, I felt obliged to again enter upon the responsibilities of that chair, one of the most important positions in the medical profession of the United States. I have not been compelled to roam about from one medical school to another in search of employment, nor have I ever been informed by my brother professors that the school could get along very well without me. I have never with vile treachery engineered in one school, while worming myself into another. I have never lyingly, traitorously, told a board of Trustees, in a letter of resignation of a chair, that I should continue to be the constant friend, the aider at all times, of the school under their care, while working my way into another institution, designed to subvert the school toward which I made these scandalous, lying professions of friendship. I never assured the Dean of the school, when he waited on me to request me to withdraw

my resignation, that I should be found the constant friend of his school, while I was hatching a plot to blow up a portion of its faculty, and a portion of the faculty of the school I was trying to enter. While engaged to the faculty, adverse to the school that had befriended me, and tried to honor me, I never assumed to be a member of the school I was trying to victimize, by calling a meeting of its faculty at my house, never attempted to hector them into a scheme of consolidating the two schools on a basis of *gratuitous* teaching, after making myself contemptible and ridiculous as the puny and thoroughly whipped advocate of high fees. I did not, I could not do any deeds of this kind, that would require the dismissal of portions of two faculties, among whom I was, while pretending to be friendly to both, the "acrobat riding two horses running in opposite directions." I am happy to say that I have no professional standing nor character of this kind. If I had, I should feel well satisfied that my opinions of the "personal, social, or professional" success of anybody or of anything, were not worth the paper on which they were written. If Dr. E. S. Gaillard is a specimen of success "personally, socially, or professionally," I devoutly thank heaven, all the friends I ever possessed, all that now honor me with their affection, their esteem and confidence, that I am not such a success. If Professor Henry M. Bullitt is not the ablest member of the Faculty of the Louisville Medical College, a faculty cursed with the incubus of the presence of Gaillard, he certainly has no superior in it. I have long enjoyed the friendship of this gentleman. When he occupied, two years ago, the chair of Theory and Practice in the University, he requested me to fill his place while he was absent on a visit to Staten Island. I did this for about two weeks. That was Professor Bullitt's recognition of my professional standing.

In addition to that honorable position which I hold in the University of Louisville, I have a practice in my profession, the demands for which, for over thirty years, have been beyond my power to supply. I have numbers of families who have

relied upon me as their only medical adviser over thirty-seven years. My practice has never been more laborious than it is now. I have, in all their fullness, those accompaniments which Shakspeare says should be the blessings of old age:

“Honor, love, obedience, troops of friends,”

troops that are all that I can desire them to be—troops that I would not exchange for all other earthly possessions.

I have been a member of the College of Physicians and Surgeons for many years; indeed, throughout its existence. I have lived with its members in perfect peace and harmony up to the time that Dr. Gaillard infused his spirit into its proceedings, last spring. I have never been arraigned, personally before this medical body. Since the first of last May, Dr. E. S. Gaillard has been not only tried twice, but severely condemned both times. The first trial was, from over-confidence in his power over the College, at his own instance. Upon two distinct items of the matters, items involving direct charges of falsehood, the committee of the College reported the guilt of Dr. Gaillard. He was shocked, and complained before the College that the committee was very hard on him, but the College sustained the report and ordered it to be printed. One of those items consisted of a flagrant, flagitious falsehood written and published by Dr. Gaillard against Professor Bodine. The College said Dr. Bodine was entirely innocent of Dr. Gaillard's outrageous charge. After the College had pronounced this terrible judgment Dr. Gaillard underwent the humiliating work of confession, in a public printed document, of his libelous conduct. Here it is:

“A PERSONAL CARD.

“EDITORS OF THE SUN: There was published in the Sun during the month of May a correspondence between Dr. J. M. Bodine, Dean of the Medical Department of the University of Louisville and myself, and in this correspondence Dr. Bodine was charged by me with having been guilty of ‘public equivocation under official oath.’

“As the circumstances which produced this conviction in the minds of others and myself have been fully explained, I

desire to withdraw this charge as publicly as it was made. I perform this act of justice with pleasure, and I do so the more promptly because it has not been asked or expected.

“E. S. GAILLARD.”

I have no “personal, social, nor professional” status of this description.

Another item of Dr. Gaillard’s false charges was in stating that the University had never, as affirmed by its faculty, sent a committee to propose to the Kentucky School a conference on equalizing the fees of the two schools. The College gave as its decision, that the records of the University conclusively established the truth of the statement of its faculty and condemned Dr. Gaillard’s statement as false. What can be the ideas of such a man of personal, social, and professional standing? His denunciations are as futile and harmless as the passing breeze.

For one special piece of the demoniac malevolence of Dr. E. S. Gaillard I am grateful. It is in these words: “Occupying as he,” (Dr. Bell) “did the comfortable, honorable, lucrative position of recruiting officer for negro regiments to be sent against Southern men, and the equally lucrative and distinguished position of Grand High Janizary of ‘the draft,’ not to mention the reputable office of secret informer and persecutor of those among whom he acquired all that he ever possessed,” etc. For this wholesale, audacious lying I am thankful, since it gives me the opportunity of defending myself against floating gossip and misrepresentation. Dr. Gaillard is the best gossip-meter I have ever known. If a man wishes to find out what gossip is stirring about him, he can easily find it by exciting the anger of Dr. Gaillard. He is greedy to swallow all that he can get hold of, and such characters are likely to be thoroughly stuffed. Now for the lies. I never held at any time, nor in any way, any position, lucrative or otherwise, “of recruiting officer for negro regiments.” Nor was I ever, within my knowledge, Grand High Janizary of “the draft.” I have not the slightest idea of any meaning in

that phrase. A Janizary is a Turkish foot soldier. Worcester gives the word no other meaning. I think I can safely say I never was a Turkish foot soldier.

But I well know the demoniac meaning of the lie, that I was "a secret informer and persecutor of" those among whom I lived during the war. Dr. Gaillard could not have invented a more audacious falsehood. I proceed to nail this forgery to the forehead of its perpetrator.

On the Saturday night before General Boyle forwarded his resignation as Commander of the District of Kentucky, I met him at the house of Captain Z. M. Sherley. In the presence of the late E. L. Huffman, Captain Sherley, and myself, General Boyle remarked that Dr. Bell exercised a great influence over him, and that in no instance had he ever suggested a desire that any one should be arrested, nor that any one should be punished, but that he often interfered where arrests had been made, and that in no instance of such interference had he ever failed in obtaining the release of the person or persons. Captain Z. M. Sherley authorizes me to say that he has frequently heard General Boyle make similar remarks.

Col. Henry Dent and myself were on the most confidential terms, for years before the war, and during its entire continuance. He was the first Provost Marshal appointed in Kentucky. He served in this capacity throughout the military administrations of Generals Anderson, Sherman, Buell, and Boyle. If I had been capable of "being a secret informer or persecutor," I must have carried on the business through Col. Dent, or with his knowledge. I present his statement of the truth on the subject:

"LOUISVILLE, KY., October 1, 1869.

"For a long period of years before the war, during the whole of the war, and down to the present time I have been, on the most intimate and confidential terms with Dr. T. S. Bell. I was the first Provost Marshal under General Robt. Anderson, continued in that service under his successor, General Sherman, under General Buell, and under his successor, General Boyle. In all

that time Dr. Bell never suggested the arrest of any person, never asked for nor hinted a desire for the punishment of any person, and never gave information against any one. But in a great number of instances in which persons had been arrested on the complaint of other parties, Dr. Bell, at all times exhibiting the strongest feeling against what he deemed improper oppression, interposed before me, and in no one instance did he ever fail to obtain the release of any one in whose behalf he interfered. He always presented such strong reasons against the holding of those for whom he interested himself that he obtained their release."

[Signed.]

HENRY DENT.

Colonel T. B. Farleigh was the Commandant of the post during the administration of General Burbridge. I was very intimate with him, and I could not have done the things charged without his knowledge. He knew of everything I did in military matters while he was Commandant of the post. I present his statement:

"I do not know that Dr. Bell ever caused or attempted to cause the arrest of any one; but do know that he frequently and earnestly endeavored to procure the release of many who had been arrested." [Signed.] THOS. B. FARLEIGH.

There are hosts of men and women in this city who had warm sympathies with the South. There are a great number of them who know how often and how effectually I interfered in their behalf to protect them from what I considered unjust treatment. I name a few of the prominent cases, and name them with their permission: James Bridgeford, Esq., Professor G. W. Bayless, J. F. Griffin, Dr. Virgil Maclure, and James W. Graham. I refer also to Professor S. M. Bemiss, without claiming any authority from him, but I feel sure with his full consent. He has full knowledge of the trust he confided to me, involving his personal liberty, and he will bear testimony to the manner in which I discharged my duty to him. Professor Benson, unfortunate in having Dr. Gaillard as a colleague in a medical school, could bear testimony to my numerous and long continued efforts in his behalf—efforts that did not cease until they culminated in his release from confinement—a release made on my application, as

Captain Z. M. Sherley will testify. Governor Meriwether is also another witness who knows something of the nature of my persecuting spirit. Captain T. C. Coleman and family know a great deal on this subject. I could mention scores of other cases.

The only time during the eleven sessions I have been lecturing in the Louisville University that I ever lost any part of my hour was when engaged in one of these cases. While lecturing I received a note stating that Paul R. Shipman, Esq., was under arrest and on board of a boat at the wharf, for conveyance to a point from which he could be sent beyond the lines. I dismissed the class, hurried to the wharf, and found that the boat was gone. By diligent use of the telegraph I succeeded in reaching him with an order for his return to the city. Nor did I cease my labors for him then, but continued until I got a military order fully releasing him from arrest, placing it myself in his hands. George D. Prentice, Esq., and J. D. Osborne, Esq., are familiar with these facts. I have not said anything to Professor W. T. Owen on the subject, but I am sure that he will cheerfully bear testimony to the readiness and efficiency with which I obeyed his request that I should aid him in procuring the release from incarceration of a poor unfortunate whose history Dr. Owen gave to me. I could multiply these specimens of my "persecuting spirit," but it is unnecessary to do so. These are enough to crush the liar and his lies, and that is sufficient for me. Not a single instance can be named of my having ever caused the arrest or "the persecution" of a human being; but, if it were necessary, I could name hundreds of cases where I prevented "persecution." I never, for a single day during the war, forgot that I was a physician.

A training of thirty years in my profession implanted the humanities, mercy, and kindness in my nature too firmly, to permit me to look on suffering with any other disposition than to relieve it. This was recognized by many gentlemen actively engaged in the relief of Southern sufferers. When Captain Harry Spotts was about to leave here to take charge of the St. Nicholas Hotel, in New York, he had between two

and three hundred dollars in his hands that had been raised for the relief of the Confederate wounded at the battle of Perryville. Captain Spotts came to me and requested me to purchase such articles as were needed for the Confederate sufferers, and supply their wants. I made the purchases of Messrs. Wilson & Peter, who filled the bill in the most liberal manner, and I presented their bill of items to Captain Spotts, who expressed his entire satisfaction with my expenditure of what he very properly deemed a sacred treasure. The articles were forwarded to the hospitals to the care of those who were ministering to these Confederate sufferers. General Boyle gave full permission to me, as President of the Kentucky branch of the United States Sanitary Commission, to forward to the sick and wounded Confederate soldiers at Harrodsburg the liberal contributions of their friends in this city, and I personally superintended the forwarding of these articles by the means of transportation placed at the disposal of the Sanitary Commission. At the time I was scarcely able, on account of severe illness, to stand alone. Yet I attended to these offices when I should have been in bed. Knowing as I do all my conduct throughout the war, I do not feel disposed to be swindled out of the truth by the lying malevolence of Dr. E. S. Gaillard. I had large numbers of Confederate soldiers in the hospital of which I had charge, and I know that they were nursed as tenderly and as carefully, and as fully provided for as any other wounded in the hospital. That was not a place for war, nor was any feeling of that kind ever exhibited there. I went among the Southern friends of the sick and wounded Confederates and obtained clothing and comforts for them, supplying to such as needed anything of the kind crutches and other helps, precisely as similar articles were given to the Union soldiers. There are numbers of ladies here with Southern sympathies who knew these facts at the time of their occurrence.

This miserable being, who is never happy except when he is in a muss, made in the April number of his Medical Police Gazette for 1868 the following appeal. After one of his rodomontades against the American Medical Association, he says:

"Since the red hand of slaughter has been mutually stayed, is it better to cleanse and cover it with the mantle of personal and professional charity, or is it better for physicians *to soil their banner in support of political partisanship and deplorable anarchy?*

"A long and extensive acquaintance with the best in the profession justifies the anticipation *that its members will be among the first to remove animosity and to promote harmony and good feeling.* Every hour spent in the library teaches the physician the daily lesson that science is catholic, and that her empire should be peace."

The italics are mine. If Dr. Gaillard had one particle of sensibility, these utterances of his would suffuse his cheeks with shame, in view of his vile, slanderous attempt to revive animosity, to destroy harmony and good feeling. He is, however, in work congenial to every fibre of his little mind, when engaged in *soiling the banner of medicine* with Nasby's grocery political partisanship. If hours in the "library teach the physician the daily lesson that science is catholic and that her empire should be peace," the vile political mire through which Dr. Gaillard wades shows that he has no intercourse with a library, and that *he* has not yet learned that "science is catholic."

When General Buell was in command in this District, Professor J. B. Flint and myself united in a petition that captives of the Confederate Medical Corps should be considered as non-combatants. General Buell responded that he was willing to give the order, provided we could furnish him precedents. I searched for them diligently through the night and found them. They were furnished to General Buell, and he gave the order and released the medical men then held as prisoners. That became the military law in this District from that time forward. That was a specimen of my "persecuting spirit." In what single instance did Dr. Gaillard ever extend, during the war, a hand of kindness toward a Union physician? What Union man ever heard from his lips one word of mercy or kindness? Where did he ever interfere with the military authorities and get them to withdraw the oppressive hand from man or woman even suspected of Union

sentiments? What weary, despairing Union prisoner, with parched lips and burning throat, ever received from his compassion the mercy of a cup of cold water? He knows himself better than he does me, and the base lie that I was a "secret informer and persecutor" was undoubtedly a photograph of his own conscience. The lessons of the war that constantly taught me professional kindness and mercy, Christian charity and philanthropy, could not have found room for turning in his narrow, bigoted, intolerant mind.

Poor Dr. Gaillard fairly blazes with an indignant fit of *his* Southern chivalry as he contemplates the deeds of those who were not on his side of the ditch.* The indignation is a counterfeited, gotten up for the dire emergencies of his present *necessities*. He is horrified because I was the surgeon of the Board of Enrollment for this District, but he turned his back upon the faculty and trustees of the Kentucky School of Medicine, who had done all in their power to make him respectable in this community, and he sought a partnership and position in a school containing three gentlemen who were United States contractors during the war. Professor Benson was a contractor for supplying the United States' horses and mules with food in order to enable them to do duty against the South. Professor McLean was a contract surgeon for taking care of the troops of the United States, Professor Octorlony was the surgeon of the Freedmen's Bureau up to the last hour of its existence in Kentucky. And the weeping Gaillard, sitting under the willows and making day and night hideous with his wrath and wailing over his awful memories of the internecine conflict, has his "soul" stirred with demoniac fury, as he looks at a mere surgeon of a Board of Enrollment, whose office it was to stand between his Government and the people to see that exact justice was done to each party; to see that while the Government obtained what it had a right to demand of the people, the rights of those who were physically or mentally disqualified were not invaded, and while looking at this horror, Dr. Gaillard ludicrously turns away from it and eagerly rushes into

* This was the chief animus of the original assault on me.

the embraces—into the companionship of three Federal war contractors! Verily, verily the legs of the lame are not equal.

I do not think that, outside of the pages of Munchausen, I have ever seen a more uninterrupted stream of falsehoods than that which flows through Dr. Gaillard's supplement. If he utters a single truth in it I have not been able to find it. I shall give only a few specimens. He says that I assert that he said "gun-shot wounds do not heal by the first intention." There is not a statement of the kind, nor anything like it, in my review of his shabby lecture. I did not assert anything on the subject, but quoted his own language fully on it. What benefit there is in such lying as this, I cannot conceive.

He refers to his denuded bone gem, but fails to meet the incontrovertible facts I gave. I showed that his pretended discovery is an old piece of knowledge, and that when the Richmond surgeons attacked his statements on the subject, he had no "lessons of the war" with which to meet his critics. Two years after this he seized upon Ollier for support, but he does not understand that author.

The distressed and distressing lecturer bungles his trephine follies. A greater absurdity cannot be conceived of than that contained in the fact that such a stupid ignoramus as Dr. Gaillard should attempt to criticise Macleod on a surgical matter. It is a mixture of impotence and impudence rarely seen.

Dr. Gaillard says that I assert that he "stated in his lecture that the lessons of the war first proved *that* measles, small pox, scarlatina, etc.,* *to be self-limiting* in duration." This is a false statement, made so by suppressing a material portion of what I said. My language is: "The luminous Dr. Gaillard tells us that other lessons were taught by the war. They are: 'The discovery that measles, scarlet fever ('how about scarlatina?'), small pox, etc., 'were' (or are?) 'self-limiting,' *and the discovery of the value of an abundance of fresh air.*" Dr. Gaillard shamelessly suppresses the italicised part of the sentence.

His paltry falsehood about his slander of British surgery, in

*This is unmistakably Gaillardistic. The italics in the sentence are mine.

the matter of tetanus, needs only this notice: when a pompous braggadocio is fairly cornered and coweringlly changes, for his defense, the terms his opponent uses, he confesses defeat. I quoted Dr. Gaillard's own words: "European teaching tends (?) to produce tetanus, while, by the American lessons, we have learned how to prevent it." I showed that the Confederate Surgical Manual, written by Professor Chisholm, utterly repudiates this Gaillardistic calumny by saying: "Tetanus is not more frequent among our wounded than it is in Europe. In the Crimean service Macleod mentions but thirteen cases in camp and in the hospitals." This crushing blow overwhelmed Dr. Gaillard, and he sniggeringly attempts to screen his defeat by talking about infection!

The contemptible lie "that it is notorious that for thirty years" Dr. Bell "lost no possible occasion for *attacking* every one *with his pen* whom he thought he could attack with impunity," could scarcely have emanated from any one but such a calumniator as Dr. Gaillard. He says: "So far has this been the case that it is one of the chief causes of Dr. Bell's personal, social, and professional failure in this city." We often hear of superlative attainments as well in vice and folly as in any of the virtues. The idea was entertained a short time since that the wickedest man in the city of New York had been found. I am satisfied that I can easily point out the most impudent man in Louisville. That such a man as Dr. Gaillard should coolly talk about any man as a failure passes to the sublime of impudence. The only success that he has ever won is in being an incessant quarreler. There are few men in this city with whom he has ever come in contact that he has not quarreled with. This miserable scandal-monger and scandal-manufacturer—the pitiful asserter of false and foolish things, from whose lips and pen fall lies, as toads, lizards, and serpents fell from the mouth of the girl in the fairy tale—speaks of my being a social, personal, and professional failure! The maniacal raving of the poor fellow is often amusing. Failure as I may be, I am able to do him a favor. He is a cumberer of the earth, and can now have but little to live for. Without friends or practice, having driven off the former by his vile temper and worse be-

havior, having, through his conspicuous and recognized incompetency, utterly failed to acquire the latter; without *standing* in his profession, as shown in his continuous *moving* from school to school, and having been convicted of literary theft and of varied and multitudinous lying, his condition is pitiable. And now, having starvation and disgrace staring him in the face, what can he have to live for? As he has never yet lived to any good purpose, and there is no probability that he ever will so live, he may be deterred from leaving the world by the want of a halter. If he really wishes to do the best deed, bad as it is *per se*, of his life, to imitate Iscariot and hang himself, I will furnish the rope, write his obituary, and attend his funeral. I shall do this favor cheerfully, because I bear him no malice, for, whatever his intentions have been, he has done me no harm.

Dr. Gaillard, no doubt unintentionally, pays homage again to the vast superiority of Professor S. P. Breckinridge over himself. He has got hold of something in this controversy which he provoked, too hot for him to handle, and he has made two attempts to play the monkey by fruitless efforts to make a cat's paw of Professor Breckinridge to rake *his* hot chestnuts from the fire. He is not likely to succeed in this nefarious scheme. Dr. Breckinridge is a gentleman not at all likely to permit Dr. Gaillard to use him in this way. In connection with this disgraceful work, Dr. Gaillard speaks in exceedingly complimentary terms of the editors and proprietors of the *Courier-Journal*, in describing my responses to daily attacks which I patiently bore for two months. Dr. Gaillard speaks of my responses as "ungentlemanly and obscene." I question whether he has any idea of what is gentlemanly or ungentlemanly. The statement that the editors of the *Courier-Journal* permit the publication of obscene articles, when the statement rests on no better authority than that of Dr. Gaillard, is scarcely worthy of their notice.

The learned pundit in Hindostan matters, in attempting to defend his fly story in connection with a "Brahmin student," says: "Dr. Bell does not know that Sterne borrowed this," and I say that Dr. Gaillard is in the same blissful ignorance. He in-

sinuates rather than asserts the lie that Sterne is a plagiarist as well as himself. Professor Bowling had applied the fly story, without naming its origin, to Dr. Gaillard, and, as usual, he makes up for the paucity of his own resources by borrowing from the affluence of others. When senselessly quarreling with Dr. Dawson, he remembered how he felt when Professor Bowling used the fly story on him, and pretending that he got it from a Brahmin student, he lets the fly story loose at Dr. Dawson.

Dr. Gaillard speaks of my "recalling those hours and days when he" (I) "campaigns in Jeffersonville or New Albany, because there was a rumor that the 'boys in gray' were coming." The value of this lie may be determined by the fact that I never was in New Albany or Jeffersonville even the half of an hour during the entire war. I leave the rest of the vulgar lying of Dr. Gaillard's supplement to take care of itself. I turn now to the exposition, nay, the demonstration of one of the most shabby, despicable specimens of falsehood ever exhibited by any perpetrator of literary larceny. In allusion to my exposure of the disgraceful plagiarism from Professor Gross's lecture by Dr. Gaillard, he says :

"Some allusion must now be made to one of the most absurd and ludicrous events in Dr. Bell's very ludicrous history. In the writer's lecture on "The Medical and Surgical Lessons of the War," as published in the *New Eclectic Magazine* (Baltimore) for June, 1860, there occurs(?)* a few typographical errors, as the result of which one of the writer's own paragraphs appears as an extract, while several sentences from a lecture of Dr. Samuel Gross, of Philadelphia, which should have had the usual extract or credit marks ("")† are published as the original remarks of the writer. Dr. Bell, ignorant, most unhappily, of this fact, selects some of these sentences of Dr. Gross, and supposing them to have been written by the author of the lecture under review, levels against them a sample specimen of his popgun fusilade. Some of his friends, recognizing the absurdity of his error in criticising Dr. Gross, inform him of his foolish mistake, when the mortified

*Gaillardistic. †Why did they not get them?

and discomfited critic adopts the only redress in his power. He resorts to the expedient of publishing a *postscript* to the scurrilous pamphlet, which he then distributed to the professional and unprofessional throughout the city. This postscript was intended to convict the writer of plagiarism by containing on one side of a page the writer's language, as published in his lecture, and on the other side of the same page Dr. Gross' language, as extracted by the writer from Dr. Gross' pamphlet. As the writer made the extract from Dr. Gross'* pamphlet, it is not very astonishing that the language of Dr. Gross and his own are identical. This Dr. Bell seizes upon and publishes as a gross plagiarism, monstrous conduct, etc., etc. He did not know that as soon as the writer's lecture was published in the Baltimore Magazine, June, 1869, he wrote to Dr. Gross regretting the typographical errors, and received from that gentleman the following note :

“‘PHILADELPHIA, June 29, 1869.

“‘MY DEAR DOCTOR: It was hardly necessary to send me an excuse for the printer's blunders in the Baltimore Magazine. No one who knows anything of your character would accuse you of unfairness in anything. * * * * *

“‘Wishing you health and prosperity, I am very truly, your friend. [Signed.] S. D. GROSS.’

“Dr. Bell, however, committed a still more silly blunder in this connection. When he thought that he was criticising the writer's language, there were no terms of abuse sufficient for his purposes, but when he finds that the language he criticised is from the pen of Dr. Gross, his sycophancy destroys his common sense, his judgment, and his memory, and he eulogizes in a manner absolutely disgusting the very language that he had so violently condemned!! What honesty and what fairness there is in this honorable transaction!! What character and truth are here displayed!!”

In view of these mendacious lies Dr. Gross would have hit the nail on the head by leaving off the “un” in his note as the prefix to fairness.

*This form of saying Dr. Gross's is decidedly Gaillardistic.

I have thus given the convicted plagiarist the full benefit of his own statement. The reader will perceive that Dr. Gaillard attempts to cover up his vile literary larceny by adroitly insinuating that his lecture, "*as published in the New Eclectic Magazine, contained 'a few typographical errors, as the result of which one of the writer's (Dr. Gaillard's) own paragraphs appears as an extract, while several sentences from a lecture by Dr. Samuel Gross, of Philadelphia, which should have the usual extract or credit marks (' ') are published as the original remarks of the writer'*" (Dr. Gaillard). "Several sentences from a lecture of Dr. S. D. Gross," says the modest Gaillard. Several! Worcester says that several is any *small* number more than two. The number of sentences thus stolen from the lecture of Dr. Gross is fifteen! They are patched together on one page by Dr. Gaillard, but were stolen from two pages, 22 and 30, of Dr. Gross's lecture. The convicted plagiarist says that the typographical blunders in the New Eclectic Magazine caused him to appear to be a plagiarist, thus slandering the innocent printers of the New Eclectic Magazine. There is not the shadow of truth in this statement made by Dr. Gaillard, as I shall presently demonstrate. In June, 1869, he wrote a letter to Dr. Gross in which he made the same mendacious statement, and with it deceived Dr. Gross. I wish he would now get another letter from Dr. Gross. I have presented the full facts of the case to Dr. Gross, and shall send him a copy of this, by which he can take the exact measure of Dr. Gaillard as an honorable, "gentlemanly," honest correspondent. Let the reader now mark a few plain facts, and he will understand the deep duplicity of Dr. Gaillard's letter to Dr. Gross and toward the readers of the Gaillard Medical Police Gazette.

Dr. Gaillard delivered in October, 1868, the only public lecture he has ever made in Louisville. It contained a considerable number of passages stolen from Dr. Gross's lecture, delivered in Philadelphia twelve months previously. He palmed off on his audience this stolen ware as his own manufacture. He made no allusion to Dr. Gross before the audience, and he does not dare to say he made any, because he knows that I could convict him of

falsehood if he were to make such an attempt. He next published the lecture here in Louisville in October, 1868, and in that, published under his own supervision, he neither alludes to Dr. Gross as the author of the only respectable part of his lecture, nor does he make a mark to show that it was borrowed. He next made a furious attack on me in the spring of 1869, to which I responded in the June number of the Nashville Journal of Medicine and Surgery. The guilty conscience of Dr. Gaillard then saw a "dagger of the mind proceeding from" the want of brains, he quakes and his knees knock together with the fear that I may get hold of his plagiarism. He had enjoyed whatever fruits there were in the theft for eight months, but he now wakes up and hurries off, in the latter part of June, a deceiving letter, designed to deceive Dr. Gross. He fixes the attention of Dr. Gross upon imaginary typographical blunders in the New Eclectic Magazine's *republication* of his lecture. A more shameless falsehood was never uttered. That portion of the Gaillard lecture, consecrated to the theft from Dr. Gross, published in the New Eclectic Magazine, is a precise, an exact copy of the theft from Dr. Gross, as published in this city by Dr. Gaillard himself eight months before the publication in the New Eclectic Magazine. In proof of this I submit the following statement from George D. Prentice, Esq., and from Mr. Bradley, of the firm of Bradley & Gilbert, two gentlemen thoroughly skilled in the investigation of typographical errors. Read their statements:

"At the request of Dr. T. S. Bell I have compared the lecture of Dr. Gaillard, published by himself in Louisville, in October, 1868, with the publication of the same lecture contained in the New Eclectic Magazine (Baltimore) for June, 1869, and the portions said to be taken from an introductory lecture of Dr. Gross are precisely the same in both publications.

[Signed]

GEO. D. PRENTICE.

"I fully concur in the preceding statement."

[Signed]

THOS. BRADLEY.

Here then is a most damning, a most overwhelming exposure of an attempt to cover up a literary larceny by stupendous lying.

The Louisville larceny was enjoyed and enjoyable by Dr. Gaillard for eight months. Not a single public notice did he ever make of this literary larceny until twelve months after he perpetrated the plagiarism, and then he made the degrading one that deepens his disgrace, only because I had exposed him. He did not hurry off a letter to Dr. Gross in all those "eight months." In sending the lecture as printed in Louisville to the New Eclectic Magazine, he took no precaution to have a correction of the Gross larceny, but slanderously charges faults upon the innocent printers at Baltimore, when he knew while doing this that they "followed copy," and that the entire criminality was his own. He had lost the right to make quotation marks, without explanations, because he had so marred and mutilated the language of Dr. Gross that he would have been guilty of literary forgery in using mere quotation marks. In order to draw off the mind of the reader from his nefarious work, he mendaciously says: Dr. Bell "selects some of these sentences of Dr. Gross, and supposing them to have been written by the author of the lecture under review, levels against them a sample specimen of his pop-gun fusillade," or, as orthographers spell it, fusillade. Now, Dr. Gaillard knew that this was atrociously false. I did not comment on a single word of Dr. Gross's portion of the Gaillard lecture, as the reader will see by turning to page 22 of this pamphlet. I said: "In his usual clumsy style he attempts to describe the revolution that has taken place in blood-letting." This alludes to his expression, "we can scarcely realize that *condition* of the professional and unprofessional mind *when* the lancet was regarded," etc. The italics are mine and indicate the clumsiness I charged. *When* refers to time, not to *condition*. The only word in the *theft* about which I said anything was *paragon* of physic, and that was not Dr. Gross's, but a mutilation of Dr. Gross's language, made by Dr. Gaillard. As a matter of course, the statement made by Dr. Gaillard that any of my friends informed me that I was criticising Dr. Gross is a manufacture of Dr. Gaillard's. There is not even an approach to one truthful statement in any portion of Dr. Gaillard's sentences on the subject of what I said or did in rela-

tion to this part of his disgraceful lecture.* Here is a singular specimen of his incorrigible proneness to falsehood, even when he has nothing to gain by it. He says: "As the writer made *the extract* from Dr. Gross' pamphlet it is not very astonishing that the language of Dr. Gross and his own *are identical*." The italics are mine. Here are two falsehoods. First, Dr. Gaillard did not make simply *an extract*. He patched two extracts together that are eight pages apart in Dr. Gross's lecture. Second. The language of the original and that of the theft are not identical. For example, Dr. Gaillard drops out the word *pocket* from the first sentence of Dr. Gross. In the second sentence he drops the word *such*. In the third sentence he changes Dr. Gross's *standpoint* into *guide*. In the fourth sentence he alters Dr. Gross's *devoutly thanks God* into *is devoutly thankful*. In the fifth sentence he barbarously alters Dr. Gross's "*god of physic*" into "*paragon of physic*." There are five sentences in the "*young physic*" portion of the theft, and the reader will perceive that Dr. Gaillard makes an alteration in each one of the five sentences. In that part stolen from another page of Dr. Gross's lecture, where Dr. Gross describes Mr. Hazard as *one of the founders of Muuch Chunk*, Dr. Gaillard, perfectly ignorant of Mr. Hazard, converts him into "*a prominent gentleman in the West!*" Dr. Gaillard changes Dr. Gross's language about Moliere, and omits the words "*dulcifying clysters*." Dr. Gross quotes the Patlander as saying to Mr. Hazard, "Then, by St. Peter," etc. The Gaillardistic alteration is, "Then, by St. Patrick," etc. And with these facts staring him in the face, this hardened, veteran falsifier says that the language of his theft from Dr. Gross is *identical* with that of the original. And talks of omitted quotation marks!

Dr. Gaillard says nothing about the theft from Dr. Gross of

*Dr. Gaillard is so hard pressed with my indubitable facts that he manufactures fictions and adorns them with exclamation points. He says: "He (Dr. Bell), eulogizes in a manner absolutely disgusting, the very language that he had so violently condemned." As I have already said, the reader, by turning to page 22 of this pamphlet, will see that I neither censured nor condemned a single word in the language of Dr. Gross, even when I supposed it was Dr. Gaillard's, and if the reader will turn to the first page of the Postscript to this pamphlet, he will see that my "eulogy" says merely: "I was surprised" (when I supposed that it was Dr. Gaillard's own language) "at the easy flow of the sentences, at their vast superiority in sense, vigor, and accuracy over anything that I had seen from his (Dr. Gaillard's) pen." Now an author may be vastly superior to Dr. Gaillard as a writer and then be no great things. This style of "eulogy" was undoubtedly "absolutely disgusting"—to Dr. Gaillard.

the quotation from Moliere's dialogue of Sganarelle and Geronte. That was not in the New Eclectic Magazine. It is on the last page of the Louisville edition. The evidence is conclusive that this was stolen from Dr. Gross, because Sganarelle is not spelt by Dr. Gross as Moliere spells it, and as I have always seen it spelt, except by Dr. Gross in this instance, and of course it was spelt in the same way in Dr. Gaillard's plagiarism. Dr. Gross does not give the name of the comedy from which he takes the incident, and as Dr. Gaillard did not know the name he follows in Dr. Gross's footprints.

Why could not this offender against the laws of literary morality, instead of trying to relieve himself from one crime by the perpetration of another, rather try to mitigate punishment by offsetting an honest confession against his crime? He could have said with entire truth: "I had to make an exhibition of myself before an audience in one of the most intellectual cities of the Union. It was necessary that I should make a favorable impression upon the trustees of the Kentucky School of Medicine, its faculty, its assembled students, and the citizens. For this I was in a state of utter destitution. My necessities, my pressing needs, compelled me to steal from Dr. Gross something that would dazzle and deceive my auditory, and I never felt a qualm of conscience on the subject, until an impending exposure compelled me, after eight month's quiet enjoyment of my literary larceny, to hurry to make a *private* but dishonest whisper to the man I had robbed. But even then I did not recognize that I owed a confession of my outrage to the trustees of the Kentucky School of Medicine, to my colleagues of the faculty, to the medical students, and the citizens, on whom I had imposed my flagrant, my scandalous, my disgraceful plagiarism."

This might have been hard to do, but it should have been easier, and would have been more reputable than lying.

I have thus redeemed my promise to gibbet this pestiferous quarreler. I have pinned upon him, ineffaceably, the charge of a monstrous plagiarism and have demonstrated the monstrous falsehoods by which he attempts to screen himself from public execra-

tion and professional degradation. This crime of plagiarism is not a new thing with Dr. Gaillard. His essay on diphtheria is a crude mass of plagiarisms from one end to the other. There is not one ray of classical learning in it that was not taken bodily from Bretonneau's work on diphtheria. All of it about Aretaus, except the wrong spelling of the name; all the Latin quotations from Aretaus, to say nothing of numberless other things, were taken by the busy plagiarist from Bretonneau's work on diphtheria. I wish Dr. Gaillard would deny this.

In the futile hope that he may hide his guilty head, Dr. Gaillard attempts, very feebly, to charge me with plagiarism in my lecture on Scandinavia. In the attitude that he occupies before the public, he may charge as much as he pleases, provided he does not prove it. But this he cannot do, because I gave in the lecture the names of all the authorities I used. If he could show such a letter as I received, in acknowledgment of a copy of my lecture on the "Pre-Historic Ages," etc., from the able and learned author of the work to which Dr. G. refers as "proof-sheets," he would esteem it as worth more than all "the extravagant and untenable eulogy" he says, he received from a committee of the Georgia State Medical Society. As I have not become degraded enough to publish a private letter, this is the only reference I can make to this noble and flattering letter.

I have not in any part of this controversy made a single statement about Dr. Gaillard that I had not and have not the best of reasons for believing to be true. It would be impossible for me to give the least credence to anything that rests on his unsupported statement.

He complains that I refused to answer what he calls "a polite note" from him. I not only refused to do so, but I shall continue in that line. I stated to his friend that Dr. Gaillard had, without cause or excuse, made an insolent, insulting *public* attack on me, and that so far as I was concerned he should fight it out before the public. I added that I should not on any terms or under any circumstances hold a private correspondence with him.

I said in a former part of this *addendum* that the College of

Physicians and Surgeons of this city has on two occasions severely condemned Dr. Gaillard's professional conduct. I have already recorded one of these occasions. The second is a conspicuous case. Professor L. P. Yandell arraigned his conduct for violating the 6th article of the Code of Ethics. The case went before the Board of Censors. Four of the gentlemen—Professors Powell, Rogers, and Ireland, and Dr. R. C. Hewett—made a report condemning Dr. Gaillard. By superior drumming, a minority report made by Dr. Brandeis was adopted by a majority of four votes. On this Dr. Gaillard publishes in the October number of his Medical Police Gazette the statement that he had gained a signal victory. But he was perfectly aware when he published this statement that at the next meeting after the minority report was carried by a majority of four, a new proceeding was instituted, by which the principles of the majority report of the Board of Censors, which severely condemned and rebuked Dr. Gaillard, were adopted by a vote of twenty-one against six. After this a motion to adjourn the College of Physicians and Surgeons *sine die* was carried.

At the second meeting of the revived College after this action, when the meeting was composed mainly of those who were considered the friends of Dr. Gaillard, an attempt was made to remove this condemnation from him, by a motion to reconsider the decision against him; but even in these circumstances he failed by a vote of five for to seven against the motion.

In the article in his Medical Police Gazette, thus condemned, the pensioner of Dr. Gross said that "medicine and medical office had fallen from a state of glory into one of disgrace"—that the profession had lost all but "a little of its honor, lucrativeness, and respectability." At a very recent meeting of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, he gave a display of his lofty conceptions of medical science and of the dignity of professional pursuits. He introduced a resolution—almost bawdy in its very nature, well adapted to the reduction of the offices of the physician nearly to the level, or beneath those of the pimp—a resolution to legitimize a proceeding akin to that, which, in 1866, called forth in a Cincinnati medical journal a specimen of raillery from Professor

Parvin not often excelled by the writer of Don Quixote. When Professor Gaillard presented his resolution, the College heard it with expressive silence—a silence of horror or of contempt. It was a killing silence. Not a member of the College opened his lips. The thing was emphatically still-born. It did not utter a cry, and the snubbed and agonized parent hurried the thing into the shroud of withdrawal. Alas, what an extension of traffic was thus nipped in the bud. If the College had adopted the resolution, if its members could have mustered up courage or brass enough to let the public know what it had done for professional advancement, and if women could have been induced to submit to this vulgar thing, there might have been an immediate demand for Craig's microscope, as the proposed legitimating required the use of a microscope. Would it not be well for Dr. Gaillard to devote his Medical Police Gazette to getting up a commercial convention for Craig's microscope, as he signally and humiliatingly failed to get the College of Physicians and Surgeons to forward the interests of that instrument and his own in it? Need the medical profession feel much concern as to what such a man as this says about it—a man who could scarcely see its "honor or respectability" even with one of Craig's microscopes, which he puffs and peddles for a percentage? He names this percentage business as one of my falsehoods. Little as I care for what he says, I shall notice this charge. All his readers are familiar with the number of times he has bored them through his journal with notices of Craig's microscope. I have heard physicians complain of his Craig microscope twaddle. He denies that he thus worried his readers on this subject, as a *percentage* matter. I think it is that and something more. In the *advertisement* of the Craig microscope in Dr. Gaillard's journal, the proprietor offers it at *two dollars and a half*. In Dr. Gaillard's *editorial notices* of the Craig microscope, he requires parties that may order one of Craig's microscopes to send *two dollars and seventy-five cents*, as he says for "*the proprietor*" of the instrument! Now, why is this extra quarter levied upon those who may patronize *his* peddling? Can it be that he holds that a

medical student who is not able to pay more than two dollars and a half for a Craig microscope is low and disreputable and does not deserve one, and that the extra quarter demanded by Dr. Gaillard is a part of that "high fee" doctrine, which enables him to separate the "sheep from the goats," those being goats that buy the instrument from its proprietor, and those the only Simon Pures of respectability who pay him a quarter of a dollar more than those who get the magic affair from Craig? No wonder that the righteous soul of St. Gaillard is fretted when he sees "respectability in the medical profession" hawked about at a quarter of a dollar, and that circumstances make him the peddler. The proprietor charges only two dollars and a half for the instrument, no matter who sends for it. But in addition to this, the proprietor of the instrument says that he *pays* all editors who act as his agents *ten per cent.* on their sales, and I understand from first-rate authority that Dr. Gaillard has sold nineteen dozen of the instruments. If, then, the persistent din of editorial calls by Dr. Gaillard upon the medical profession to patronize Craig's microscopes, on the sale of which he gets ten per cent., to say nothing of the extra quarter of a dollar, are not *percentage notices*, pray what are they? Let not Dr. Gaillard be uneasy. I shall not be a "secret informer" against him, nor his "persecutor," by informing against him at the internal revenue office for carrying on the business of a peddler without a peddler's license.

In connection with this percentage business Dr. Gaillard grows indignant over the charge that I have been overhauling his private correspondence. As he admits that I must have got hold of some of it, he admits that he perpetrated the correspondence of which I spoke, and his denial applies, I suppose, to my description of it as "whining and whimpering." I have only this to say, that had I started on such business I think that my very act would have shown a "whining, whimpering" disposition, and this whiffler need not waste his indignation on me. If he would employ it properly against his own conduct, he would find use for all he has.

With his usual richness of logic, Dr. Gaillard attempts to prove

that, because I positively refused to hold a *private* correspondence with him on a matter which he had, without cause or provocation, opened on me before the public, *therefore*, I was guilty of his frivolous charge that I had often pleaded "old age or religion as an excuse to avoid responsibility." This is worthy of Curran's Counsellor Therefore. Dr. Gaillard has, I think, adorned every senseless quarrel he has had in this city with announcements of his personal responsibility and the place of his residence.* If there were any excuse for a resort to ruffianism I think that I might claim it. Dr. Gaillard could easily have lived in peace with me through a long professional life, as my medical brethren in this city have done. Instead of proprieties of this kind, he chose to proclaim an intensely aggressive war upon me, and the only responsibility to which I have held him or desired to hold him is that terrible one, exposure of the assailant to the public, before which he made his election to prosecute his wanton, scandalous, inexcusable assault upon me. He very earnestly desired to ruin me. If he has learned that the tables have been turned on him, the fault is all his own.

But, even if it were true that I had ever pleaded my religion as a reason why I should not be a ruffian, is there one truthful, faithful, Christian intelligence on the earth that would hesitate in saying, that it is infinitely more honorable, courageous, and manly to *remember* than to *forget* the supreme laws of Christianity? Myriads have preferred death under the most horrid tortures, rather than forgetfulness of them, and they are honored in heaven and on earth.

This malevolent abuser and calumniator of the medical profession, tries his puny malice on Professor Bowling. That gentleman has more medical renown, more honorable professional recognition than Dr. Gaillard has a right even to dream of—more medical learning and dignity in a single hair of his head than

* In the outrageous, utterly disgraceful assault in personalities, which he made on the venerable Professor Yandell, a Nestor among physicians and a preacher, before the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Dr. Gaillard flouted his personal responsibility and his place of residence for Professor Yandell's edification. Professor Yandell's answer commands the admiration of every member of the medical profession in this city that I have ever heard speak of the Gaillardistic scene before the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Dr. Yandell quoted an altered couplet from Pope :

"On one so lame a sword you would not draw,
On one so poor you can not take the law."

Dr. Gaillard has in his whole body, more than he will ever have. His professional improvement or advancement are among the utterly hopeless things of this earth.

Dr. Gaillard little dreams of the demands made on me, from various parts of the Union by medical men personally unknown to me, some of whom are among the ablest medical writers of the day, for copies of *all* of my defensive articles against his vile, his slanderous assaults on me. As I have not a Medical Journal of my own, the above mentioned fact must be evidence to him that he is beginning to be notorious; his repute, such as it is, is spreading. May I venture to congratulate him?